



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
0770269900	03/02/87	USHIMA	011021

FITZPATRICK, BELLA, HARTER & SCINIO
277 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10172

EXAMINER	
KATZUNG, JR.	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
117	5

DATE MAILED:

03/10/87

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449 | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152 |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474 | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-19 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims 12 are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-11 + 13-19 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes until such time as allowable subject matter is indicated.
8. ☐ Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. These drawings are ☐ acceptable;
☐ not acceptable (see explanation).
10. ☐ The ☐ proposed drawing correction and/or the ☐ proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner, ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved, ☐ disapproved (see explanation). However, the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. It is now applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are corrected. Corrections **MUST** be effected in accordance with the instructions set forth on the attached letter "INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES", PTO-1474.
12. ☒ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☒ been received ☐ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other _____

Serial No. 034196

-2-

Art Unit 129

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119, which papers have been placed of record in the file.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

The species of the working examples.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a generic claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of the other invention.

Serial No. 034196

-3-

Art Unit 129

Pursuant to the September 4, 1987 telephonic requirement for election of species, applicants' attorney, Mr. Perry, elected the compound No. 20. Claims 1 to 11 and 13 to 19 are grouped therewith. Claim 12 stands withdrawn from further consideration as not being readable on the elected species.

Claims 1 to 4, 18 and 19 are rejected as being improper Markush claims in the definition of X as =N-, =CH- and -CH₂-. So substituted, the resulting total compounds are structurally diverse and patentably distinct one from the other. A reference anticipating one under Section 102 would not be a reference against the others under Section 103. Limitation of the claims to compounds where X is =CH-, thus encompassing the elected species, will overcome this rejection.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This claim is improperly dependent back on two previous claims.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Serial No. 034196

-4-

Art Unit 129

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1 to 11 and 13 to 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Tretter or Bloom et al in view of Rokach et al, Helsly et al, Takizawa et al and the Journal of Medicinal Chemistry articles. The primary references disclose 11-aminopropylidene substituted dibenzoxepines (useful as psychotherapeutic agents and as exhibiting antihistaminic activity). The secondary references disclose related dibenzoxepines substituted on the benzo ring with the various - Y-A substituents of the present compounds. Accordingly, the present substitution is held to be within the skill of the worker in the art.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the

Serial No. 034196

-5-

Art Unit 129

obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Applicants' citation of EP 214,779 is noted. Its publication is after the filing date of the present application.

RAYMOND:wdh

A/C 703 557-3920

9/15/87

Richard L. Raymond
RICHARD L. RAYMOND
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 129